

Claims 1-9 are pending. In this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify an aspect of the invention. Support is found in for example paragraphs 74-85. Care has been exercised not to introduce new matter.

Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,067,066, hereinafter “Kubota”) in view of Copley et al.(U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063646, hereinafter “Copley”). Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 3 and the claims dependent thereon clearly distinguish over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth below.

In the statement of rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to make the on-resistance value of the switches on the high-voltage side as taught by Kubota have a lower resistance value than the resistors as taught by Copley. It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination as set forth by the Examiner is improper, and hence inapplicable, because the cited prior art is not appropriately combinable,

First, the secondary reference to Copley relates to a completely **nonanalogous** art with respect to the claimed invention and with respect to Kubota. Specifically, Copley relates to a **signal processor incorporating digital to analog converters**. What relation that has to do with a signal line driver circuits for an image display is not apparent on this record. It is inconceivable that one having ordinary skill in the art, concerned with any problem associated with the signal processor incorporating digital to analog converters disclosed by Copley, would have had the remotest inclination of venturing to the art of the signal line driver circuit for an

image display. *In re Clay*, 966 F.2d 656, 23 USPQ2d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Ex parte Dussaud*, 7 USPQ2d 1818 (BPAI 1988).

Further, in Applicants' invention, the purpose of the switches having smaller on-resistance than coupled resistors is to control smoothly the colors of an image display. In contrast, Copley aims at supplying a reliable voltage input to the op-amp 24 by the implementing the on-resistance of the switches much smaller than the resistance of the associated resistors. (See FIG. 6 and paragraphs 52-53) This difference further undermines the Examiner's attempt to combine Copley and Kubota.

The above **differences** between Copley on the one hand, and Kubota and Applicants' invention on the other hand, demonstrate that one of ordinary skill in the art, without impossible hindsight, would not have combined these references relating to two disparate devices.

With respect to independent claim 3, the Examiner relied on the combination of Copley and Kubota to teach all limitations of claim 3 as asserting that if the values of resistors and switches are same the values can be reversed, while admitting the reversed relationship is not taught by Copley and Kubota. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination as set forth by the Examiner is improper, and hence inapplicable for the foregoing reasons, and, even if forcibly combined, the combination fails to teach the invention of claim 3.

Amended claim 3, in pertinent part, recites "a relationship of a potential difference between the high-voltage side voltage and a predetermined reference voltage and that between the low-voltage side voltage and the reference voltage and a relationship of on-resistance values of said high-voltage side and low-voltage side switches are reversed." As addressed in paragraphs 74-85, the relationship between the on-resistance values of low-voltage side and that of high-voltage side differentiates effects of the image control of an image display. When the

on-resistance of high-voltage side switch, e.g. B₈ is higher than that of low-voltage side switch, e.g., A₈, it realizes smooth transition between voltage levels. On the other hand, when the on-resistance of high-voltage side switch B₈ is smaller than that of low-voltage side switch A₈, it can shorten the time for the signal line drive circuit to write given voltages to the pixel signal lines. Considering the reversing arrangement has a distinctive objective, the reverse arrangement is not taught by the combination as the Examiner asserted.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims 1 and 3 are patentable over Copley and Kubota. Claims 2 and 4-9 dependent upon and including all limitations of independent claims 1 and 3 respectively are patentable over Copley and Kubota for the same reasons.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/HL/lcb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: May 7, 2007